

**Remarks**

Further and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

Claim 17 has been amended to specify that the thin film comprises an alloy of Ni and at least one of Fe, Mo, W and Cu. Support for this amendment is found on page 7, lines 20-22, page 10, lines 13-17 and Examples 1-4 of Applicant's specification. Additionally, claim 17 has been amended to delete the word "minimum" and to add the phrase "at a wavelength" in the last line. Claims 19 and 20 have been amended to provide antecedent basis.

Claims 21-24 have been cancelled without prejudice.

New claim 25 has been added to the application, and is directed to an embodiment where the layers forming the multilayer of the thin-film have different optical properties from one another. This is apparent from the working examples in the specification, wherein the optical properties of each layer of the multilayer are different depending on the sputtering conditions such as kind of atmosphere, combination of atmospheres, the temperature of the substrate, the sputtering power and sputtering time, etc.

The rejection of claims 17 and 21 as being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph is rendered moot by the claim amendments.

The patentability of the present invention over the disclosure of the reference relied upon by the Examiner in rejecting the claims will be apparent upon consideration of the following remarks.

Thus, the rejection of claims 17-24 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Anderson et al. is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner takes the position that Anderson et al. disclose a thin film substrate comprised of a glass substrate and metallic coatings, wherein the metallic coatings are coated over onto the glass substrate for optimal light transmission and light reflection. The Examiner further states that tantalum is first coated onto the glass substrate, followed by a second metallic coating which can be  $\text{Fe}_2\text{O}_3$  and CoO, or a tin material. Lastly, the Examiner states that the reference has no mention of including chromium in the metallic coatings.

Applicant has amended claim 17 to require that the thin film comprises an alloy of Ni and at least one of Fe, Mo, W and Cu. Anderson et al. do not teach a thin film comprising one of Ni-Fe, Ni-Mo, Ni-W or Ni-Cu, as required by Applicant's amended claim 17. On the contrary, as stated by the Examiner, Anderson et al. disclose a multilayer having a first film formed of metallic tantalum, and optionally a second film of  $\text{Fe}_2\text{O}_3$  and CoO or a Sn material.

Additionally, the Examiner takes the position that although some of Applicant's claims include process steps, it is the product itself which must be new and unobvious.

Applicant respectfully submits that for the reasons stated above, Applicant's product is new and unobvious over the cited prior art. Furthermore, since claims 18-20 depend on claim 17, the subject matter of claims 18-20 is patentable over Anderson et al. for the same reasons the subject matter of claim 17 is patentable over the reference.

For these reasons, the invention of the pending claims is clearly patentable over Anderson et al.

Therefore, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the ground of rejection set forth by the Examiner has been overcome, and that the application is in condition for allowance. Such allowance is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Tadakatsu SUZUKI

By:

  
Amy E. Pulliam  
Registration No. 55,965  
Agent for Applicant

MRD/AEP/pth  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
March 31, 2005